

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/578,308

Applicant(s)

SAKATA ET AL

Examiner

MATTHEW D. MATZEK

Art Unit

1794

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MATTHEW D. MATZEK

(3) _____

(2) Ryan Chimomas

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 May 2009Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all discussedIdentification of prior art discussed: all discussedAgreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative called to tell Examiner that his client would not be willing to accept the language proposed by Examiner to amend claim 1. Examiner was also told to provide an Office Action based upon the current claims and Examiner's interpretation of the claims would be considered henceforth.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Matthew D Matzek/
Examiner, Art Unit 1794